LP
F
5012
1844
N
3 9004 01407665 4

Rev. Wm. Bell

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

SCRIPTURALLY CONSIDERED.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

SCRIPTURALLY CONSIDERED.

BY BENJAMIN NANKEVILL,

WESLEYAN MINISTER.

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—ISAIAH viii. 20.

TORONTO:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, AT THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN OFFICE,

No. 9, WELLINGTON BUILDINGS, KING STREET.

1844.

L
F501
1844 N

J. H. LAWRENCE, PRINTER.

INTRODUCTION.

It is perhaps needful to apprise the reader of my reasons for this publication, and to make a few prefatory remarks:—The following Tract is the substance of a Sermon preached to a congregation of several hundreds, convened for that purpose, in the centre of the Township of Augusta, C. W., upon the Camp-ground in that neighbourhood, on Sunday, August the 6th, 1843. My reasons for thus publicly and formally discussing this subject at that time were—motives of *self-defence.* Our Baptist brethren in these parts had been publishing and urging their peculiar views relating to Baptism with the industry and pertinacity for which they are characterized; and not only had they made some converts from without, but a few of our own people began to be unsettled. These facts and circumstances, backed by a very strongly-expressed wish on the part of friends and others, induced me "to stand for the defence of the Gospel." The Sermon is thought to have set the subject at rest in this vicinity; hence it was the wish of several who heard it, and of a number of ministerial and other religious friends who only saw it in manuscript, that it should be published. This request, together with the consideration that a summary work, such as this, was a desideratum among those who have not much time for reading, and but limited means for the purchase of books, overcame my natural aversion to an attempt at authorship.

It will be observed that I have dropt the text and laid aside the form and arrangement of a Sermon. This I have judged it best to do; as it has enabled me to bring forward some important matter which could not otherwise have been so conveniently disposed of—while at the same time it has enabled me to discuss the subject more consistently.

It may be just and proper to observe that I have helped myself liberally to the thoughts and arguments of others, whenever they would assist me in my purpose. Still, I have but seldom distinguished

77919

such passages by marks of quotation—(1) because they are so seldom quoted *verbatim*, or anything more than in substance; and (2) because they are so completely woven into the very texture of my argumentation. I would, however, just say to the reader, that the authors on whom I have most frequently drawn are Wesley, Merritt, and Clinton. The *nature* of Baptism I have only incidentally discussed, that being a branch of the main question concerning which there is but little controversy.

A word or two will be expected on the literary character of this production. On this subject the courteous reader will allow me to say, that to a highly-cultivated literary taste I make no pretensions. Hence, in this performance, I have not taken that pains to form and polish my sentences which, perhaps, I might have been expected to take. One reason has been—I have got it up in haste, under the pressure of many important duties and engagements. Another is—I have been chiefly anxious to make myself understood; and I have eschewed all attempts at ornament, as unsuitable to the style and character of a work purely argumentative and controversial.

It only remains for me to say, that, in giving this essay to the Public, I am influenced by no other motive than a desire and a hope to subserve what I conceive to be the cause of truth and christian unity. Having thus endeavoured to accomplish my undertaking, at least in the spirit of candour and kindness, I commend it to the impartial and attentive perusal of a Christian community, devoutly imploring the blessing of the Most High upon it.

THE AUTHOR.

Augusta, C. W., *October* 18, 1843.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

SECTION I.

THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

First, I shall notice the subjects of Baptism, and endeavour to prove and vindicate the Divine right of Infant Baptism, as briefly and plainly as I can. But previous to entering on the proof of the point before us, let it be observed and remembered, that there is nothing in the New Testament against Infant Baptism. It is nowhere said or hinted that the Apostles forbade, or refused, or declined to baptize infants; or that any child of a believer was, after he was grown up, baptized upon a profession of faith. It must also be acknowledged, that infants are capable not only of the outward sign of Baptism, but also of having an interest in the blessings and grace of the new covenant, and of coming under its bonds, which is the thing signified in the ordinance, and that they need those new covenant blessings. Further, it is nowhere declared in Scripture, either in express or equivalent terms, that adult persons only, or that none but those who believe or profess faith, are to be baptized. In short, there is absolutely and certainly nothing that stands in the way of our embracing the doctrine of Infant Baptism. Since there is nothing against it, we shall inquire if we can find any kind of evidence in favour of it, and I think enough may be collected from the Scriptures to put the matter beyond all reasonable doubt. This controversy having made so wide a breach in the Church of Christ, the subject becomes important.

Let us then with christian candour, in the fear of God, examine the subject and search for the truth. Truth is always important, and what concerns us all to know. If our faith and practice are consistent

with the word of God, if our ordinances are valid, if our standing in the Church of Christ is regular, it is a matter of importance that we should know it, and be steadfast in the truth; if not, it is a matter of equal importance that we be convinced of our error. Let truth stand and let error fall.

If any deny the Baptism of infants, it is for them to show that their right to it has ceased, and that Jesus Christ has left them out of the church. The silence of the New Testament, if it were silent respecting infants, would leave them exactly where they had always been respecting their right to church membership. But it is not silent; it takes notice of infants, and that in a way to show that their right to their standing in the church has not ceased, but is acknowledged and confirmed by Jesus Christ himself. Mark x. 13, 14, 16. 'And they brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.' Here we see young children brought to Christ. We see Christ much displeased with his disciples, when they rebuked those who brought them. He says, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not.' How tender and how emphatical does the blessed Saviour speak! 'Suffer the little children to come unto me.'

When God's visible kingdom was established in the world, he made provision for the little children. Being members of this kingdom, Christ owns and acknowledges them; because of this, they must be brought to Christ. It is in vain for any to say these were adult believers. They are called 'young children' and 'little children.' They were 'brought,' and Jesus 'took them in his arms.' Luke says they were 'infants,' xviii. 5. And why were they brought to Christ?

Matthew tells us, xix. 13—'They were brought, that he might put his hands on them and pray,' which was the common mode of blessing. Matthew, Mark, and Luke, all tell us that Christ said—'Of such is the kingdom of God.' Had not these children been members of the covenant and kingdom, Christ would not have treated them in this manner; but it may be inquired, what are we to understand by the kingdom of heaven? I answer, it is plainly the church which is here meant: for Christ declares, that these children were then members of the kingdom of heaven. The plain meaning of our Lord is, that infants belong to him as his subjects—are subjects of his kingdom in whatever sense you understand it. And what better evidence can there be, that any are the subjects of the kingdom of heaven, than the testimony of the King himself? Though infants are not able to speak for themselves, yet Christ has spoken for them, declaring that of such is the kingdom of heaven. Will Jesus then suffer the little children to be neglected now? Has he lost his love for the little children? Will he disown them, and be offended because we bring them unto him? No, he has not lost his love for them. He has not left caring for them. He has given directions that they be received in his name. Matt. xviii. 5.—'Whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me.' Christ's disciples and his church are to receive them in his name. 'In his name.' How is this? It is to receive them into covenant, and call his name upon them, as the Apostles received the household of Lydia and the Jailor, and all others to whom they administered Baptism. For of such is the kingdom of heaven. The common exception, that these infants were not baptized by Christ, nor were brought to him for any such purpose, is altogether irrelevant: for we do not argue, that infants are the subjects of Baptism, because we suppose that these infants were baptised by Christ; but that infants belong to the Church, is here plainly asserted, and that all such as belong to the church are the subjects of Bap-

tism cannot be denied. It is further asked, why Christ did not then baptize them, if they were proper subjects of his church? Before men urge such questions, they should make it appear that these infants had not been baptized before. However, whether they were baptized before or not, is of no importance to us. For if Christ did not baptize these children, yet he gave them as sure a token of church membership as baptism itself, when "he laid his hands upon them and blessed them." It is further objected, Christ's entire silence about Infant Baptism, at this time, has no favourable aspect on such a practice. I answer, Christ having asserted the church membership of infants, and solemnly blessed them with imposition of hands, and having said nothing against the baptism of them, more than of adults; these things have a very favourable aspect on the practice of Infant Baptism, and imply a good warrant for it. This then is what I contend for, that infants are members of Christ's church, and of his kingdom; and, consequently, fit subjects of Baptism.

Again, there is undeniable proof that Christians are now under the covenant made with Abraham, which covenant included his infant offspring. The Abrahamic and Christian covenants are the same. Gen. xvii. 7.—'I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee.' Gal. iii. 14, &c.—'That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ.' 'Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise.' 'For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is

neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.' We may further observe, that it has always been customary for children to be included in covenants with the parents, to come under the bonds and receive the privileges therein stipulated. It is also certain that when God has been pleased to covenant with mankind, the children as well as the parents have been comprehended. This appears to have been the case in the covenant with Adam, with Noah, with Abraham, and with the Israelites at Mount Horeb. Indeed this seems to have been the case in all God's federal transactions with the children of men. Hence the Apostles are so far from teaching that Christ has annulled God's gracious covenant with the fathers, or taken away any of the privileges therein granted to them or their children, that St. Paul asserts the contrary, in Rom. xv. 8.—'Now I say, that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers.' Hence, our children are still children of the covenant, to greater advantage than ever.

The Apostle tells us again, that the covenant with Abraham was 'confirmed of God in Christ;' and that the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, 'could not disannul it.' Indeed, the third chapter of Galatians, and fourth of Romans, are proofs that the covenant with Abraham abides in force, under the Gospel dispensation; and that the Gentile believers, with their children, have an interest in it which can never be evaded. The Apostle says, that 'they who are of faith are the children of Abraham.' And being his adopted children, 'they are heirs.' They inherit the blessings of his covenant and all those privileges of church membership which were granted to Abraham and his seed. The Apostle adds, 'The blessing of Abraham is come upon the Gentiles through Jesus Christ;' which is as if he had said,—

the blessings and privileges granted in the covenant with Abraham belong, and are conveyed to, the Gentile church;—the very same privileges, without any diminution, both for them and their children. 'If ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.' The Anti-Pedobaptists endeavour to confound the Abrahamic covenant with the ceremonial dispensation, with a view to prove, that as the one was abolished when Christ died, so the other must be also. There are no two things in the Bible more distinct than these, and none more clearly illustrated by the Apostle, Gal. iii. 17.—'And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.' This passage teaches us, that the covenant made with Abraham was confirmed of God in Christ, and had no connexion with, or reference to, the ceremonial Law; that the ceremonial Law was four hundred and thirty years after, and was a temporary business; but the covenant with Abraham was indissoluble in its nature, having Christ for its foundation; and was never so completely realized as under this last dispensation of Gospel grace. I know a celebrated writer of the Baptist order, Elder Merrill, says, 'The Covenant of Circumcision appears to be annexed to this Law;' and that 'the Covenant of Circumcision, which was incorporated with it, hath passed away.' The Law of Ceremonies, we all know, is abolished. We have no dispute here. But to say the covenant of circumcision was annexed to this law, or hath passed away, is grossly absurd. To say the covenant made with Abraham, which was the constitution of the church, was annexed to the law of ceremonies, and became null and void, when that law was no longer in force, is to say, God has ceased to be Abraham's God, and the promises to the believer and his seed are to be relied on no more.

Perhaps I shall be reminded, that this covenant,

which cannot be made void, was four hundred and thirty years before the law, whereas the covenant of circumcision was about four hundred and *six* years before the law with which circumcision was united. It is true, the dates of the Bible make it about four hundred and thirty years, from the time when God appeared to Abraham, (Gen. xii.) to the giving of the Law. And what then? What God proposed, or promised, in the 12th chapter, he did in the 17th renew, ratify, and confirm by a fixed seal. It is evidently but one and the same covenant of grace, because the promises made to Abraham, and the conditions required of him, in each chapter are, for matter and substance, the same. Neither does St. Paul say the confirmation was four hundred and thirty years before the law.

If the confirmation was delayed for the space of twenty-three years after the covenant was proposed, that makes no difference, so long as it was confirmed and circumcision was made the visible seal; and this St. Paul hath plainly told us—2 Cor. i. 20—'For all the promises of God in him (Christ Jesus) are yea; and in him Amen.' Does not the 17th chapter contain promises, as well as the 12th? Rom. iv. 11.—'And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had.' Was circumcision a seal of the righteousness of faith in Christ, and the covenant not confirmed in Christ? Rom. xv. 8.—'Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers.' To deny that the covenant, of which circumcision was the seal, which was the covenant confirmed of God in Christ, is to deny a plain Bible truth, and make the Apostle palpably contradict himself; because, all the promises in Christ are yea and Amen. 'Circumcision is a seal of the righteousness of faith.' And Christ is 'a minister of the circumcision.' Circumcision and the promises in Christ cannot be separated. Hence, such a shift as our Baptist friends have to resort to, when they deny circumcision to be the seal of the righteousness of

faith, betrays a consciousness that they see, lurking beneath the covenant of Abraham, a consequence most fatal to their cause.

In this covenant the Gospel was preached. Gal. iii. 8. —'The scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.' 'Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness;' in other words, he was justified. If then the Gospel, if Justification, if Christ, and his whole plan of redemption, are essential articles in the covenant of grace, the covenant made with Abraham was the covenant of grace.

So long, then, as this covenant stands, and believing Gentiles are brought into it, the divine right of Infant Baptism stands good. Were there not another argument in favour of it, the practice is to be justified. The inference is fair and irresistible, that the same persons who were subjects of the seal, when the covenant was first instituted, are subjects of the seal now, and the same qualifications which were once sufficient are sufficient still.

Express Scripture will show us that the covenant was perpetual, and the church is now the same as the church then. 1 Chron. xvi. 15.—'Be ye mindful always of his covenant, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations; Even of the covenant which he made with Abraham, and of his oath unto Isaac; And hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant.' Psalm cv. 8.—'He hath remembered his covenant for ever, the word which he commanded to a thousand generations: Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; And confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant.' See Hebrews vi. 13, 17. Words cannot more strongly than these express the perpetuity of the covenant. It is here, as elsewhere, expressly called 'an everlasting covenant,' 'confirmed as a law;' 'confirmed in Christ,' saith the Apostle; made

sure by the oath of God, 'by which God hath shown the immutability of his counsel,' saith the Apostle again; 'commanded to a thousand generations.' But from Abraham to Christ was only forty-two generations, as we are informed in the first chapter of Matthew. The covenant made with Abraham, then, must continue nine hundred and fifty-eight generations after the birth of Christ, which will perhaps complete the age of the world. Here is plain Scripture, and a man may as well deny the whole Bible as deny this. But an objector may inquire, Is not a definite number sometimes used for an indefinite? Truly. But a thousand is never used for forty-two. When a thousand is used for an indefinite number, it means as many as there be. Psalm l. 10. —'The cattle upon a thousand hills are mine.' The meaning is, all the hills over all the world. So, in these passages where the covenant of Abraham is said to be 'commanded to a thousand generations,' the meaning is an exact thousand, or else all the generations from that time afterward to the end of the world.

What has been said confirms the idea, beyond a doubt, that the Gentiles were united to the Jewish church. Christ did not take the kingdom suddenly from the Jews. Those who received the Gospel were not 'broken off;' believing Gentiles were added to, or incorporated with them; and the unbelieving Jews only were 'broken off.'

Rom. xi. 17.—'And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou (Gentiles) wert grafted in among them, and with them (the Jews not broken off) partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree.' 'Grafted in contrary to nature,' verse 24. Hence the trunk of the tree is not injured, and the branches were not all broken off. Many thousands remained. Acts xxi. 20.—'And when they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe.' And the branches, which were broken off, are yet to be 'grafted in again.' Rom. xi. 24.—'How much more shall these, which be

the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive-tree'—into the same covenant-standing as they were in before they were broken off. When the Jews shall be converted, and inquire after their olive-tree, from whence they were broken off, will they be satisfied to hear the Anti-Pedobaptists say, '*We*, and we only, possess your Olive-tree. You must unite with us. Other denominations baptize their children and receive them into the church. But children have no business in the church. To seal them with the righteousness of your faith is to seal a blank.' Will the Jew, I say, be satisfied with this? No; with disdain he will reply, 'This is not my Olive tree; the God of Abraham never taught you this.'

If the covenant made with Abraham was a covenant of grace, as has been proved, then Baptism must be a seal of the same covenant, and must have been instituted in the room of circumcision, just as the Lord's Supper was instituted in the room of the ancient Passover. Was circumcision the sacrament of admission into the church of Israel? So is Baptism into the church of Christ. Was circumcision a badge of relation to the God of Israel? So is Baptism of relation to Christ. And was circumcision a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, and of the righteousness of faith? So is Baptism. The analogy in these, and many other particulars, plainly shows that Baptism was instituted in the room of circumcision. It is a seal of the same covenant, and of course it ought to be administered to our infant offspring. Each ordinance was also administered in a manner very similar.

A name was given the circumcised child. Luke i. 59.—'When they came together to circumcise the child, they called his name Zacharias.' It was a matter of importance that the name should be called aright, as it could not be altered afterwards. This is evident from the words following. Again,—Luke ii. 21.—'When eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called Jesus.'

The calling of a person's name in this ordinance was of Divine appointment. God gave a name to Abraham and to his wife when he instituted this rite and received them into covenant. The name which a person receives in the solemn ordinance of circumcision, or baptism, is sacred. God hath designed that our own names should remind us of his name and covenant faithfulness in Christ. Further: several passages of Scripture plainly allude to the practice of calling God's name over the circumcised child. 2nd Chron. vii. 14.—'If my people, which are called by my name.' Expressions of this kind are frequently to be met with. So it was foretold in prophecy, that the heathen, or gentiles, should be called by God's name. Amos ix. 12.—'And all the heathen which are called by my name, saith the Lord.' St. James quotes this passage, Acts xv. 17.—'And all the gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord.' As the Jews were called by God's name—had God's name called upon them,—so the prophet foretells that God's name should be called upon the Gentiles. This was done when the Gentiles received Baptism, the ordinance of admission into the church and covenant of God. This is the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, given by the mouth of the Lord Christ; Matt. xxviii. 19.

The seal of God's covenant, which was the ordinance of admission into his church, must be sanctioned by the solemn invocation of his holy name. And those who omit calling the name of the person for fear of imitating circumcision, might for the same reason omit calling the name of the Trinity.

I know our Baptist friends object to baptism taking the place of circumcision, by inquiring:—1st. 'If baptism succeeds circumcision, why are females baptized?' Answer—Females were no more neglected under the former dispensation than the males. The covenant promise, 'I will be a God to thee and to thy seed,' comprehends females as well as males.

Sarah was brought into covenant, and had a name as well as Abraham. So when God says, 'If my people which are called by my name,' (upon whom my name is called) he comprehends both sexes. The females, then, were contained in the promise,—had a name given them, and the name of God called upon them. In administering the ordinance to the different sexes, there was a circumstantial distinction, (and it was circumstantial only;) the males had a mark in the flesh, but the females had not. It is highly probable that the mode of receiving females was by baptism. Credible writers of antiquity tell us, Gentile proselytes and their children were first baptized, and then the males were circumcised. The mode in which female proselytes were received was by baptism. And whence came this practice of admitting female proselytes by baptism, if this had not been originally the mode in which females were admitted? This seems to be implied, Acts viii. 12.—'And they were baptized, both men and women,' that is, male and female. Under the former dispensation, women or females were admitted into the church by baptism, but now both men and women.

This we know, that the females were in the covenant and members of the church, as well as the males. They had the same privileges of communion with God in holy ordinances. Christ declares the woman whom he healed (Luke xiii. 16.) 'a daughter of Abraham;' which phrase imports a member of the church. The difference of administering the ordinances to the different sexes was only circumstantial. The material and essential parts of the ordinance were administered to both sexes alike. But now there is no distinction.

2. 'If baptism takes the place of circumcision,' say our Baptist brethren, 'it is not valid, except it be administered on the eighth day.' Ans.—Circumcision was valid when administered on any day. Why not baptism? See Exod. iv. 25, xii. 48; Josh. v. 2.

3. They say again—'Baptism cannot succeed circumcision, because circumcision made a visible mark

in the flesh by which a person's standing might be known, but baptism does not. Ans. Females were received then without a mark in the flesh. And for males, this mark was no evidence of their standing, or membership in the church, except it appeared so from the records. Ezra ii. 62; Neh. vii. 5, 64. The reason was this: the posterity of Ishmael and of Esau, the Samaritans, and some other nations, had the same mark as well as the Jews. The thing was so common, that it was no more a mark of distinction than no mark at all; and when duly administered, there was the same necessity for a record of it as there is for a record of baptism. These objections, then, amount to nothing. Circumcision and baptism do signify the same ends, and were administered with the same solemnity. This is satisfactory evidence that baptism does succeed circumcision, and is appointed to take the same place in the church.

Circumcision being continued, under the ministry of the Apostles, and by the guidance of the Holy Ghost, it must be used with the same spiritual meaning it had before; that is, as a token of God's covenant and seal of the righteousness of faith.

The covenant interest of children, the institution, and mode of baptism, were taught in the writings of the prophets. Hence, the apostle says expressly, and with the greatest solemnity, that he had taught 'none other things than the prophets and Moses did say should come.' Acts xxvi. 22. One fact, which carries irresistible conviction along with it, we will here introduce; it is this:—The language of the prophets was, 'Thus saith the Lord;' but the language of Christ and the apostles was, 'Thus it is written;' 'What saith the Scriptures?' 'The Scripture saith,' &c. Did Paul preach none other things than the prophets and Moses did say should come? 'No,' says Paul; 'nothing else.' The writings of the prophets and Moses was the rule of his preaching, and from this rule he says he had never departed.

We will, then, try the strength of this ground with the Anti-Pedobaptists' side of the question in dispute. Did Moses or the prophets say, that the time should ever come when the children of believers should be denied the privileges of covenant interest and standing? —that they should ever be denied the seal of the covenant? These are the proper questions to be asked. And what are their answers? No, truly, no! Neither the prophets nor Moses say any such thing. There is not a syllable of any such thing in all their writings. It is then certain that Paul never taught any such thing as our brethren hold. The plain testimony of Scripture truth stands directly against them, and they cannot remove it. Again: Did Moses and the prophets teach and require believing parents to give up their children to God in covenant, and put the token of the covenant, the seal of the righteousness of their faith, upon them? Truly the Prophets and Moses did so teach and so require.

To make this matter plain we will look among their writings, and see what is said on this subject. Moses, in the 17th chapter of Genesis, records the whole transaction how God made a covenant with Abraham, and commanded him to put the token of the covenant upon his children. This token St. Paul calls 'a seal of the righteousness of faith.' Moses further tells us how God promised to be a God unto Abraham, and to his seed thus given up, and how this covenant should endure forever, and how the Gentiles should be brought to the enjoyment of it, under the Gospel, as has been shown before. Again: Moses, in the 29th chapter of Deuteronomy, leaves it on record how he took the children of Israel as God commanded him, and required them, old and young, parents and babes, to enter into covenant with the Lord,—verse 10. As seen before, infants were included in all great covenant transactions, and, according to God's institution, were capable of entering into covenant, and were required so to do; and no man has a right to deny what God

requires. Such is the light which Moses gives on this subject.

We will now select a few passages from the Prophets. Ps. cxxvii. 3,—'Lo, children are an heritage of the Lord, and the fruit of the womb is his reward.' The heritage of the Lord is his church. 1st Peter, v. 3,—'Neither as being lords over God's heritage.' Hence children are members of the church, and fit subjects of baptism. The prophet Isaiah, foretelling the coming of Christ, and the Gospel day, says, (22, 24,) 'And they shall hang upon him all the glory of his father's house, the offspring, and the issue.' 'The offspring and the issue' shall be hung upon Christ. They belong to God's house, which is the church. Heb. iii. 5.—'And Moses, verily, was faithful in all his (God's) house, but Christ as a son over his own house,' that is, the church. Here we see children hung upon Christ. They belong to God's house, and are fit subjects of baptism.

The success of the Gospel, and the ingathering of the Gentiles into the church, is foretold, Isaiah xlix. 22: 'Behold, I will lift up my hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring their sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders.' Isaiah lxv. 23: 'For they are the seed of the blessed of the Lord, and their offspring with them.' Jer. xxx. 20: 'And it shall be with their children as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before me.' All these, and many others which might be mentioned, are clear prophecies of the gospel day, and expressly mention that children must be in the same circumstances as they were before. Thus God, in his holy and everlasting covenant, has fixed the standing of children. This then was what the Apostle Paul taught, 'none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come.'

We have another unanswerable proof that the children of believers are to be members of the visible church, and consequently subjects of Baptism. 1 Cor. vii. 14: 'The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and

the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.' Now since we find that the title, or appellation 'holy' is never given to any person in the world, except he be of the church—and since the Apostle declares that the children are holy—it is a plain and undeniable consequence, that such children are of the church, and are the proper subjects of Baptism.

The Anti-Pedobaptists have endeavoured in vain to wring and wrest these words of the apostle to a compliance with their tenets. In the first place, they would persuade us that the holiness which the Apostle here intends, cannot be that which is implied in, and connected with, church membership. For they say the same holiness which is ascribed to the children, is also attributed to the unbelieving parent. If the children are 'holy,' the unbelieving husband and wife are also said to be 'sanctified.' I answer—The Apostle's words plainly show that the unbelieving yoke-fellow is only 'sanctified' to the believer, as all the creatures of God are said to be sanctified to the saints, so that they may have a holy use and enjoyment of them. Thus, again, we see infants are legitimate subjects of Baptism. And what reason can be assigned why it should not be so? Do not infants belong to Christ as partakers of the Atonement? Has he not died for them, and risen again, delivering them from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for them? Are not infants as well as believers in a justified state, according to Paul? Rom. v. 18, 19: 'Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.' Here, it may be observed, that the infant and the believer stand in the same relation to Christ as partakers of his death. They are both justified, as having no actual sin lying against them. Why, then, should they not be acknowledged

as his, and treated accordingly, by being admitted into his Church, and having the seal of the covenant put upon them, which seal is Baptism?

Infant Baptism has been the practice of the church from the apostolic age, according to the testimony of the earliest writers. The fact, in short, is this, that the validity of Infant Baptism was never denied by any christian sect till about the year 1103. It was first denied in France by Peter De Bruis. This man asserted that infants were not capable of salvation, and on that account ought not to be baptized. He had only a few followers, and his sect soon became extinct. It was next denied in Germany, by a sect called Anabaptists, about the year 1522. The whole history of the church is against our differing brethren. Justin Martyr, who wrote about forty years after the ministration of the Apostles, mentions some aged christians 'who were made disciples in or from their infancy;' while, in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, page 59, he plainly speaks of Baptism as being to christians 'in the stead of circumcision.' He wrote that Apology within forty years of the death of the Apostles; and seventy years, reckoned back from that time, which was the age of Justin when he wrote, will stretch backwards into the midst of the Apostles' time.—Irenæus, born about the time of St. John's death, mentions the baptism of infants. Take notice how near this man was to the Apostles' time. In an age so nigh the Apostles, and in a place where one of them had so lately lived, the christians could not be ignorant of what had been done in their time, in a matter so public as the baptizing or not baptizing infants.

Origen, who also lived within one hundred years after the Apostles, declares 'that infants are by the usage of the church baptized;' and that an order for the baptizing of infants had been delivered to the church from the apostles themselves. Now, since Origen was born in the eighty-fifth year after the Apostles, (for he was seventeen years old when his father suffered mar-

tyrdom,) his grandfather, or at least his great-grandfather, must have lived in the Apostles' time. And as he could not be ignorant whether he himself was baptized in infancy, so he had no farther than his own family to go, to inquire what was practised in the time of the Apostles. Cyprian, who lived one hundred and fifty years after the Apostles, gives as full a testimony as possible to the practice of Infant Baptism at the time he lived. At an assembly of sixty-six bishops, who spoke of Infant Baptism as a known, established, and uncontested practice, one Fidus questioned whether infants were to be baptized so soon as between two and three days after their birth, and whether it would not be better to defer their baptism till they were eight days old, as was observed in circumcision? which scruples he proposed to this assembly, desiring their resolution. This was complied with, and a letter sent to him, part of which I transcribe:—

'Cyprian, and the rest of the bishops who were present at the Council, sixty-six in number, to Fidus our brother, greeting:—We read your letter, most dear brother; but as to the case of infants—whereas you judge that they must not be baptized within two or three days after they are born; and that the rule of circumcision is to be observed, so that none should be baptized before the eighth day after he is born: we were all in our assembly of the contrary opinion. We judge that no person is to be hindered from obtaining the grace by the law that is now appointed; and that the spiritual circumcision ought not to be restrained by the circumcision that was according to the flesh: but that all are to be admitted to the grace of Christ. This, therefore, dear brother, was our opinion in the assembly—that it is not for us to hinder any person from Baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful, and benign, and affectionate to all: which rule, as it holds for all, so we think it more especially to be observed in reference to infants newly born; because, by their cries and tears at their

first entrance into the world, they do intimate nothing so much as that they implore compassion.'

From this piece of history it appears that both the person who moved the doubt, and all the persons who resolved it, unanimously agreed in this, that infants were to be baptized, and that it was the settled custom of the church to baptize them. If the assembly had been against Infant Baptism, they would have answered, 'It is so far from being necessary to baptize children on the eighth day after their birth, that they ought not to be baptized at all, till they are of age to judge and act for themselves.' But none of these bishops held this sentiment. They all looked upon it as a thing uncontested, that infants were to be baptized.

I shall conclude what I have to remark on this testimony with observing, that we see here confirmed what was said before—that Baptism was reckoned to be to Christians in the room of circumcision. For it was upon that account that Fidus thought it must be at the time of the old circumcision; and the bishops of the council, though denying that it should be delayed, do call Baptism the spiritual (or Christian) circumcision.

Mr. Merrill, a celebrated baptist writer, quotes the words of our Lord, 'Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;' and then adds, 'Both sides grant that Baptism, or to be born of water, is the only way of admittance into this kingdom,' (the visible church.) Very good. But Jesus says again, 'Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of God.' According to Mr. Merrill, it is then certain Jesus Christ has appointed that little children shall enter this kingdom, which he says none can enter except they be born of the water. The plain and undeniable inference is, that Jesus Christ did appoint Baptism for little children. Doubtless we may say, as did the ancient fathers, in ages following the time of the Apostles—'The church had an order from the Apostles

to baptize little children, because the Apostles received it from Christ.'

In short, we have express precedents, or examples, of Infant Baptisms, not only in the numerous household Baptisms, but in the case of the Children of Israel, 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. Tens of thousands of children were in this company. The Baptism of the Israelites, at the Red Sea, was an example for us. The Apostle says, 'Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' Verse 6: 'Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted.' The Apostle's argument is this. As their Baptism, at the sea, was an example of ours, so our conduct must be such as theirs ought to have been. Now (saith St. Paul) 'these things were our examples.' Their Baptism was by faith in Jesus Christ, (Heb. xi. 29: 'By faith they passed through the Red Sea as by dry land;') so is ours. Theirs laid them under obligation to Christ; so does ours. By their disobedience after Baptism, they tempted Christ, (verse 9: 'Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted;') by ours we do the same. Theirs comprehended their households; the little children in their parents' arms passed through the sea, and were baptized as well as their parents.

Thus far the Apostle shows the nature and extent of Christian Baptism from that example. Three times he uses the word *all*, which makes it exceedingly emphatical.

'All were under the cloud;'

'All passed through the sea;'

'All were baptized in the cloud, and in the sea.'

Thus, then, we have Scriptural examples for our baptizing our dear little ones and bringing them into covenant relation to God. Even infants in covenant are called God's children, Ezekiel xvi. 21. The result of our inquiry thus far is this, children are comprehended

in all the covenants God has made with man, and hence they are comprehended in the commands for Baptism, and many circumstances concur to agree with the fact that they were baptized. Through the New Testament, the highest qualifications requisite for Baptism in adults, are expressly ascribed to believers' children. And what stronger evidence can we need, that children have the same standing in the church and covenant under the latter as under the former dispensation? If indeed to be 'holy,' if 'to belong to the kingdom of God,' &c. are qualifications sufficient to entitle adults to Baptism, the same qualifications will entitle their children to Baptism; and this argument does irresistibly prove the fact, that the Apostles did baptize them. The Baptism of households and of the Israelites at the Red Sea concur in the same idea.

Here I anticipate an objection. Believe, and be baptized; infants cannot believe; hence they must not be baptized.

I answer—God hath made the parents perform the child's act. The parent is the head, the representative, and proxy, for his children, while they are young. Those infants which Christ took in his arms were brought to him. And who brought them? Those who had faith to obtain a blessing for them. Christ received and blessed them not according to their own faith, but according to the faith of those who brought them. Children, by the want of actual faith, are no more disqualified for Baptism than they always were for circumcision. Further: the same argument, which proves against the *Baptism* of infants, will prove against the *salvation* of infants. 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' It is certain then that faith, as a condition, is required of none but such as are capable of the exercise.

Christian parents, we see our duty and obligation to give up our dear children to God in covenant, to be faithful to instruct them in the fear of God, in the principles of our holy religion, and to be importunate in our prayers that they may be the subjects of God's grace,

and the heirs of his eternal glory. Why will you neglect a privilege so precious? Do not say, 'Baptism can do them no good.' This is limiting God. It is God's institution; and how much good it may do them you cannot tell. It is certainly unnatural towards them, as well as undutiful towards God, for you to neglect them.

Again: we challenge those who will not admit these views to produce an authentic injunction, or a precedent, for this their refusal. For certainly there is neither order nor precedent for excluding them from the church, or from the initiating rite, which rite is Baptism.

Neither is a profession of faith always required, as a condition for Baptism: hence St. Paul was baptized without any profession of faith whatever. Neither can we suppose that Ananias demurred against baptizing him, for he had the authority of Jesus. The same authority have we for the Baptism of children, without a profession of faith. For Christ saith, 'of such are the kingdom of heaven,' (the church): and hence they are the legitimate or proper subjects of Baptism. Neither can I find in the Bible that justifying faith is ever required. 'John baptized unto repentance,' and the Apostles 'for the remission of sins;' but in no place did ever John, or the Apostles, require justifying faith—but faith in the Messiahship of Jesus only. Perhaps I shall here be reminded that the Apostles were commanded to baptize believers, Mark xvi. 16: 'He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved.' I answer, the Apostles did not understand the Redeemer to require justifying faith; for the first time they administered the ordinance they baptized 'for the remission of sins.' Here observe, the Apostles were inspired men, and could not misunderstand the Saviour. This, I think, is a clear proof, yea a demonstration, that the blessed Jesus did not require justifying faith, but faith in his Messiahship alone. Again: I shall be reminded of the saying of Philip to the Eunuch, Acts viii. 37: 'If thou *believest* with all thine heart, thou mayest.' Notice the confession of faith the Eunuch made: 'I believe that Jesus Christ is

the Son of God.' And on this confession Philip baptized him. There is no confession of justifying faith here; but faith in the Messiahship of Jesus. Again: I may be reminded that 'Simon himself *believed* also, and was baptized.' Acts viii. 13. Very true. But Simon was 'in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity.' Surely this is not justifying faith. And what is said of the faith of those who were baptized with Simon? 'they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ.' Here again there is nothing about justifying faith. It is never required as a condition for Baptism; nor have we any account that ever such a confession was made by those who received the ordinance. Neither have we any precedent for baptizing justified believers, save Cornelius and his friends, on whom the Holy Ghost fell prior to their being baptized. Here I would observe, that the pouring out of the Spirit on Cornelius and his friends, and Peter's vision, was to show the Apostles that the blessings of the Gospel were designed for the Gentiles as well as the Jews. Acts x. 45: 'And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost.'

Why, then, do our differing brethren require of us a 'thus saith the Lord' for the baptism of our dear little ones, while they at the same time require as a condition of their candidates what neither John nor the Apostles ever required? Neither have they any warrant from the Bible for their conduct. Thus, then, we think enough has been said to convince any unprejudiced mind that infant children are members of Christ's kingdom on earth, (his church;) and consequently are the proper subjects of baptism.

SECTION II.

THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

We shall now, in the next place, consider the Mode. And before I enter on this subject, I must express my regret that our differing brethren cannot recognize us as belonging to the Church of Christ; hence we are told that 'there is but one door into the sheep-fold. And he that entereth not in at the door, but climbeth up some other way, is a thief and a robber. Christ is the door, and baptism is the way to Christ.'

Here, I think, there is a glaring inconsistency: they require a man to come to Christ first and be converted, and then to be baptized. Thus, on Baptist principles, Baptism is not the way to Christ; inasmuch as the Baptists expect their candidates to give an account of their conversion, and of their being justified by faith in Christ Jesus, prior to their receiving the ordinance.

I know that some of our Baptist brethren will admit, that members of other churches will be saved. Then I answer, They cannot be thieves and robbers; for none such can enter heaven. They must, then, have entered in at the right door, and have come in the right way; which is not by a mode of baptism, but repentance towards God and faith in Christ Jesus. Our Baptist brethren affirm that there is but one mode; that the mode is essential to baptism, and that mode immersion. This, they think, is fully proved by Paul,—Ephesians iv. 5, 'One Faith, one Lord, one Baptism.'

I answer, the Bible does not say one mode of Baptism, but 'One Baptism.' Now, I believe in one Baptism—the christian Baptism with water, in the name of the Trinity. We never re-baptize. But, any attempt to prove from the Bible that immersion is the only mode, is a vain and a fruitless effort. I am free to admit, that I cannot prove immersion to be Baptism, from God's

meaning of the word, as explained in the Scriptures, nor from the mode as practised by Him. For if I search the Bible to find God's meaning of the word *baptize*, it will always bring me to effusion, either by sprinkling or pouring, but nowhere to immersion. His mode practised by Him is the same. Hence I believe that water, applied in the name of the Trinity, by a proper Minister to a proper subject, is Baptism. But I cannot prove that the application of the subject to the water is Baptism. I again repeat it, neither from God's meaning of the word baptize, nor His mode. But more of this hereafter. I know that great stress is laid on John baptizing '*in* Jordan' and 'at Enon, because there was much water there.' But when we see 'Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan,' going to his baptism, we can easily conceive why he chose a place where there was 'much water,' though he baptized by sprinkling; for great quantities of water must be required for other purposes. John, whose ministry was but about a year and a half in continuance, is supposed at least to have baptized two millions of people. Matt. iii. 5.—'Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him.' The shortness of his ministry forbids the idea that John could baptize such vast multitudes by immersion. It would be scarcely possible had he been in the water continually. But while John baptized, it is invariably said, 'He baptized *with* water.' And it is unaccountable that no other term is used concerning his mode if he immersed. Matt. iii. 11.—'I indeed baptize you *with* water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost, and with fire.' Mark i. 8.—'I indeed have baptized you *with* water; but he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost.' Luke iii. 16.—'I indeed baptize you *with* water, he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost.' John i. 26.—'John answered them, saying, I baptize *with* water.' 33rd verse,—'But he that sent me to

baptize *with* water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth *with* the Holy Ghost.' Acts i. 5.—'For John truly baptized *with* water; but ye shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost.' Observe, John admits 'he was sent to baptize *with* water.' The Apostle says, 'John truly baptized *with* water.' This implies the application of the element to the subject, and not the subject to the element; and agrees with God's mode, to which the Apostle refers, which was by effusion. What right have we to say they did it differently, when the same word is used to denote both? Because John baptized at Jordan, which was a great river, and at Enon, 'because there was much water,' some have considered this a proof of immersion. 'But Jesus (John iii. 26; iv. 1,) made and baptized more disciples than John, though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples:' and neither Jesus nor his disciples went to these places. Baptism could be performed anywhere. It is evident that John did not go to these places on account of their being more convenient for baptizing than others. He might have baptized in any place. Indeed, John did not always baptize at Jordan and Enon. He began to baptize in 'Bethabara beyond Jordan,' where we read of no river. The disciples could baptize anywhere, and on the shortest notice; and they never frequented rivers and large collections of water. Still, though they baptized such multitudes, this lack of water seems to have been no hindrance, nor inconvenience. These considerations, to a candid mind, certainly render immersion incredible.

Great stress is laid on John baptizing the Saviour in Jordan; but, although John baptized the Saviour, yet he was not baptized with John's Baptism; John baptized 'unto *repentance*,' and '*for the remission of sins*.' Hence it is evident that the Saviour was not baptized unto John's Baptism. John saw an impropriety in the Saviour's coming unto him to be baptized. Matt. iii. 14: 'But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be bap-

tized of thee, and comest thou to me?' Until Jesus informed John of the nature of the ordinance he required, by saying, 'Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' 'Then he (John) suffered him.' I ask, what is implied in that expression 'all righteousness?' and answer, the meaning of our Lord is, 'that I may fully perform every part of the righteous law of God, and the commission he hath given me.' Then let us inquire, what law required Jesus to be baptized? Not the Moral law; for it says not a word about it. Not John's law; for John forbade him, which he would not have done, if his Baptism 'unto repentance and the remission of sins' required it. We find the term law, used in the Bible, only in reference to the Moral and to the Levitical law. Jesus was about to commence his great work of atonement. This he was to do in the character of priest—Heb. 5th. The law required that every priest should be washed, purified with water. Jesus must fulfil this law. None was so proper to baptize him as John: his forerunner—a prophet—the greatest among those born of women—of the tribe of Levi—himself, according to the law, a Priest. Hence Christ's Baptism was a law requirement. He must enter on it at the age of thirty. Numb. iv. 23: 'From thirty years old and upward, all that enter in to perform the service, to do the work in the tabernacle of the congregation.' Luke iii. 23: 'And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age.' He was as capable and as well qualified at twenty as at thirty; but he must be conformed to the law. And the law which required all the priests to be baptized, or washed, or purified, also required them to be sprinkled. Exodus xxix. 4: 'And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and shalt wash them with water.' Chap. xl. 12: 'And thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and wash them with water.' And in Numbers viii. 7, the *mode* is fixed: 'And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: *sprinkle* water

of purifying upon them.' The Bible speaks of no other law that required Jesus to be baptized. If he were fulfilling this law, ('and he came to fulfil, not to destroy,') he certainly was not *immersed*, but *sprinkled*.

In default of all other evidence, the case of the Eunuch—Acts viii. 39—where it is said, 'And they went down both into the water,' 'and when they were come up out of the water'—is considered by our Baptist brethren a sure proof of immersion. But I ask, Does the Bible say that Philip immersed the Eunuch? It says no such thing: there is no proof of immersion here. You agree that *Philip* did not go under, yet he 'went *down into* the water,' and 'came *up out of* the water.' How do we know that the same was not true of the Eunuch, that he did not go under? Does the Bible tell us how deep they went in? No; it tells us nothing about it. Is it right then for us to say that the Eunuch was immersed, merely because it is said 'they went in' and 'came out of the water,' when we know the same thing is said of Philip, who did not go under?

Now, I have a reason from the Bible, which induces me to believe that the Eunuch was sprinkled and not immersed. As Philip was travelling, he found the Eunuch sitting in his chariot with the Scriptures in his hand. He was reading a prophecy concerning Christ, which begins at the 13th verse of the 52d chapter of Isaiah, and continues through the 53d chapter. 'At this scripture Philip began and preached Christ to him,' Acts viii. 35. Near the beginning of the prophecy it was foretold that Christ should institute Baptism by sprinkling. 'Behold my servant shall deal prudently; he shall be exalted, and extolled, and be very high. So shall he *sprinkle* many nations.' As they travelled along they came to a certain water; and the Eunuch said, 'See here is water! what doth hinder me to be baptized?' From the Eunuch's remarks about Baptism, it is evident that Philip had explained this ordinance to him, or he would not have asked that question. Now would Philip have attempted to immerse him after they had both read

that sprinkling was Baptism, or the way in which water was to be used in the Redeemer's church. It is then more than probable they went down both to the side or into the edge of the water, where Philip might take some in his hand and sprinkle him, according to the prophecy which he had just explained to him. And it is unreasonable to believe that Philip, with this Scripture before his eyes, would administer the ordinance without being in conformity to it. And where is this prophecy fulfilled, if sprinkling is not a mode of Baptism? All things written in the Scriptures concerning Jesus must be fulfilled; and these prophecies must be fulfilled too. But if sprinkling is not a mode of Baptism; if there is no pouring or sprinkling of water in his church; then are the Scriptures not fulfilled. Hence we see the awful conclusion to which we must arrive: namely, that these prophecies have not had their fulfilment in the person of Jesus; and consequently, he can make no claims to the Messiahship. Be this as it may: I have given you my reason, from the Bible, why I believe that Jesus and the Eunuch were sprinkled and not immersed. Our Baptist friends think there is an allusion to immersion in Romans vi. 4: 'We are buried with him by Baptism;' and in Col. ii. 12: 'Buried with him in Baptism.'

On these two passages, which speak of being 'buried with Christ by Baptism,' and are thought by some to favour immersion, I shall make a few remarks, after quoting the passages in full. 'Therefore, being buried with Christ by Baptism, into death, that like as Christ was raised up by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should no more serve sin.' Col. ii. 9–12: 'For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are

complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power: in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in Baptism,' &c. These passages are highly figurative: 'Burying,' 'planting,' and 'crucifying,' are alluded to in Baptism. 'Planting,' in Scripture, is setting out trees, herbs, and vines, called plants. These being different figures, it is impossible, in the mode of Baptism, to imitate more than one of them in one operation. But all are required to be imitated, or none: all cannot be; therefore no imitation is required. Indeed it is improper, in the mode or ceremony of Baptism, to imitate either of them. The Rev. Matthew Henry, in his Exposition of the Bible, expounds these passages as follows:—'Our conformity (to Christ) is complete; we are in profession quite cut off from all commerce and communion with sin, as those that are buried are quite cut off from this world: not only not of the living, but no more among the living, having nothing to do with them. Thus must we be as Christ was, separate from sin and sinners. We are buried, namely, in profession and obligation. We profess to be so; we are bound to be so. It was our covenant engagement by Baptism; we are sealed to be the Lord's,—therefore to be cut off from sin.' Why this 'burying in Baptism' should so much as allude to any custom of dipping under water in Baptism, any more than our baptismal crucifixion and death should have such reference, I confess I cannot see. It is plain that it is not the sign, but the thing signified, that the Apostle here calls being buried with Christ. 'It is not,' says he, 'the sign, *i. e.* the ceremony, but the thing signified by Baptism, which the Apostle calls being buried with Christ.' When we in the same Baptism are said to be 'crucified with Christ' it implies, that we must ascend a cross and be fastened there, as much as when we are buried with him we must be put under water. He might have added—when, by the same Baptism we are said to be

'planted in the likeness of his death,' we must be baptized in the mode of planting. The Apostle does not say we are buried with Christ in the likeness or mode of Baptism; but, that we are by Baptism buried into the 'likeness of his *death*,' not his *burial*. He shows plainly that he did not refer to the burial, but to the death of Christ. 'Knowing,' says he, 'that our old man is crucified with him, that our body of sin may be destroyed.' The death of Christ was the accursed death of the cross. There certainly is no resemblance between immersion and crucifixion. Yet if Baptism is to represent the death of Christ, and not his burial, the mode should resemble crucifixion, not interring under ground. But really, if it were intended to represent the mode of Baptism, it is more in favour of sprinkling than of immersion. As an illustration we will give an account of the mode of burying in this country. We dig out a grave by removing the earth. We then deposit the body, and pour the earth back upon it. Now this is what we do when we baptize. The element is first removed. The body is presented; and the water is poured upon it. We always apply the element to the body; but never thrust the body through the element. This is never done in burying. Our Baptist friends assert, that in Baptism the body must be dipped or plunged entirely under water; and that, in order to be correctly done, the body must be applied in and under the water. Now this is not the mode of burying; for we pour or sprinkle the earth upon the body. Their definition, therefore, does not hold good in burying. You cannot even speak of the mode of burying, nor perform the act, without using the term pour or sprinkle, or some word equivalent, and acting in the very way that God does when he baptizes—viz., apply the element to the body, and not let the body fall through the element. But there is no kind of resemblance in our mode of burying and the way in which Christ was buried. He was deposited in a sepulchre cut out of a solid rock, large enough to sit and stand in; and his body was not covered with

the element. Perhaps a question may here arise—Why did the Apostle then say, 'We are buried with Christ in Baptism,' if Baptism has no reference to a mode of burial? Now, as we wish fully to investigate this subject, I answer, the Apostle said: 'We are buried;' 'planted into the likeness of his death;' 'crucified' by Baptism. Those who made a profession of faith in his name, looked to his death for atonement, and to his resurrection for justification. Romans iv. 25: 'If we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead: who was delivered for our offences, and was raised for our justification.' 1 Cor. xv. 17: 'And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; and ye are yet in your sins.' They professed also, (2 Cor. v. 14) 'to live unto him which died for them, and rose again.' Rom. xiv. 8, 9: 'For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's.' 'For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living.' The Jew, and in many cases the Gentile, who became a follower of Christ, was considered and treated by his friends as dead; and looked upon as one who had died an accursed death. This profession was made in Baptism; and it drew upon the person making it all the odium of the death of their Saviour. To the world they were crucified, and the world was crucified to them. Hence the Saviour calls the hatred and persecution of his followers by the world a Baptism. Luke xii. 50: 'But I have a Baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!' He confirms this by his remarks to the two sons of Zebedee. Mark x. 38, 39: 'Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And they say unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the Baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized.' The sons of Zebedee were baptized with his Baptism according to his prophecy: James

was beheaded by Herod; and John was much persecuted; and all who live godly shall suffer persecution. The odium of his death, the Cross, is upon them all. The Apostle says, Gal. vi. 14: 'God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.' 1 Cor. xv. 31: 'I die daily.' 2 Cor. iv. 10: 'Always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus.' Rom. vi. 3. 6: 'Know ye not, that as many of us as were baptized unto Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed.' Gal. ii. 20: 'I am crucified with Christ.' This language is true of every one that professes Christ; and thus it is that they are baptized into the likeness of his death. They voluntarily take upon themselves all the sorrows, trials, persecutions, and afflictions, as well as all the hopes and glories of the death of Christ. How forcibly is this set forth in the figure of our being baptized into the likeness of his death! Bearing the cross—wearing the crown. Hence I do not believe that there is reference to a particular mode of burial in the text under consideration. For the Bible is intended to be understood alike by all nations. All do not bury alike. Some burn; some embalm; some inter; some deposit in vaults; some hang up the body until the flesh decays. But not one buries by forcing the body through the element; not one resembles the mode, the way of immersion, not one the death of Christ. It was a death lifted up, on a mount, on a cross. And our Baptism is unto the likeness of his death. A death *for* and *unto* sin.

Thus have I given you my reasons why I think the Apostle had no reference to immersion, as a mode of Baptism, in the passages we have been considering.

Our Baptist brethren think, that the Philippian Jailor and his family were baptized by immersion. I have a tract now before me, called the 'Enquirer's Guide,' written by the Rev. William Storrs, in which the writer attempts to prove immersion from Acts xvi. 30. He

says, 'they went out before Baptism.' This appears to be such a gross violation of the text, that we shall consider it a few moments. The Scripture reads as follows: 'And brought them out and said, Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ; and thou shalt be saved, and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. And when he had brought them into his house,' &c. Here observe Paul and Silas had been taken, scourged, and put into the inner prison. At midnight there was an earthquake; the Jailor was frightened; he collected his family; Paul instructed them; the Jailor was convinced of the truth of the Messiahship of Jesus, and of the Christian religion; he washed the Apostle's stripes; and was baptized, he and all his. Now, the collection of the Jailor's family; Paul's instruction of them; the Jailor's washing their stripes; and the Baptism of himself and his family—appear all to have transpired in the space of one hour, in the outer prison. He brought them out from where they were, which was the inner prison. After this was accomplished, he took them into his house, that is, into his own apartment. The whole appears to have been under one roof.

Is there any thing in this account that looks as if they went away to a river or pond for immersion? Certainly not. Every circumstance forbids such an idea. Had it been necessary to go abroad for Baptism, it would probably, even under common circumstances, have been delayed until morning. And this case was attended with special reasons for delay, if it were necessary to go abroad. Paul and Silas were prisoners; and, had the Jailor gone out with them, it would have subjected him to a severe penalty. His orders were very strict; and how much he feared the punishment, if the least blame fell on him, we are informed, verse 27; 'And the keeper of the prison awaking out of his sleep, and

seeing the prison doors open, he drew out his sword, and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had been fled.' Neither would the Apostles encourage him to get into this difficulty. The Apostles, too, were put into prison contrary to law, and were determined to have recompense. When the magistrates discovered their error, they sent the sergeants to tell them they might go. All they wanted now was to get them once over the threshold of the prison doors. Paul knew too much for this, and would not stir one step out of prison until he had received a recompense. It is then evident, that the whole family was baptized suddenly in the dead of the night and in the outer prison.

After having examined the preceding subjects, of so much importance to our differing brethren, without finding immersion connected with them, we proceed to look for some other mode of Baptism beside immersion.

As God has appointed Baptism to be a standing ordinance in the church, it is reasonable to believe that he has clearly enough pointed out that mode which is most acceptable to him. Hence we proceed to show that effusion, by either pouring or sprinkling, is the mode of Baptism which is Scriptural.

I shall first search the Scriptures to ascertain God's meaning of the word *baptize*, and the mode practised by Him. In Acts i. 5: 'Jesus said, John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, not many days hence.' John had before said (Matt. iii. 11), that Jesus should baptize with the Holy Ghost. What language does prophecy use in relation to the Baptism of the Holy Ghost? Does it ever speak of dipping, plunging, immersing, in the Holy Spirit? It speaks plainly, and never intimates any thing of the kind. Let us hear Isaiah (xliv. 3), 'I will *pour out* my Spirit upon thy seed;' Joel (ii. 28), 'I will *pour* my Spirit upon all flesh;' Isaiah (xxxii. 15), 'Until the Spirit be *poured* upon us from on high;' Ezekiel (xxxix. 29), 'For I have *poured* out my Spirit.' Does the New Testament say that any were even dipped, plunged, or

immersed, in the Holy Spirit? Not the slightest hint is given that this was ever done. Matt. iii. 16: 'John saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon Jesus.' John xx. 22: 'Jesus breathed upon them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.' From these prophecies and their fulfilment we would not expect a case of immersion in this promised Baptism of the Holy Spirit. This Baptism was performed by the Father. He was to send the Spirit. John xiv. 16, 17: 'And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth.' This Baptism was performed on the day of Pentecost. Acts ii. 3: 'And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.' Again, Acts xi. 16: 'Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost.' There is no immersion here; for Peter says in the fifteenth verse—'And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell* on them, as in us at the beginning.' We are endeavouring to ascertain the meaning of the word—*baptize*. Our Baptist friends say there is but one meaning—total immersion; and therefore, there could be but one mode. This I shall disprove; and show, from the Bible, that it means *to pour*, *to sprinkle*, *descend upon*, as seen above. Here then is a mode, and a meaning, that is not immersion. They must therefore give up their one mode and meaning, or contend that there are two Baptisms—the one of water, and the other of the Spirit. But this will not alter the case. For, even if there were two Baptisms, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the word does not mean—*total immersion*, as explained by Jehovah. I have proved clearly, that it means to pour out, as used by the great Author of the Bible. John truly baptized. So did God. John baptized with water. John i. 31. Therefore came I baptizing with water. God baptized with the Holy Ghost. We have no reason to suppose they did it differently. But if they did, there are two modes and

meanings to *baptize;* the one that John gives—the other given by God. God's is pouring. Which is safest for us to take? There is but one Baptism. John said (John iii. 30), 'I must decrease, but he (Jesus) must increase.' John's Baptism has not only decreased, but ceased long ago. Acts xix. 5. Certain disciples, who had been baptized unto John's Baptism, were re-baptized in the name of Jesus. Again, I repeat it, that while John did baptize, it is invariably said, 'He baptized *with* water.' And it is unaccountable that no other term is used concerning his mode if he immersed. But his has given place to Christian Baptism. This then is one Baptism; and includes that of the Holy Spirit. 1 Cor. xii. 13: 'For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.' It is in the name of the three, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit. It embraces the mode of the three; for they 'agree in one.' The Spirit's mode is pouring out. The Father's mode is the same. The Son was to baptize '*with* fire.' As the mode of the Father and Spirit is clear, and our friends say that there is but one mode to one Baptism, there cannot be a different mode required by the Son from that of the Father and the Spirit. We see that this mode is not immersion, but by pouring out. I have proved that God's meaning of the words baptize and Baptism do not mean immersion; and that, if there be but one mode of Baptism, it is not by immersion, but by effusion.

Perhaps I shall be reminded by those who differ from me, that the Baptism to which reference has been made in the foregoing remarks, is spiritual Baptism, and not water Baptism. I answer, I am willing to search for the meaning of the word *baptize*, as used by the Holy Ghost in the Bible, in reference to water Baptism. We give the Baptist definition of the word baptize. They say it means to dip, to plunge—total immersion; as when a person holding a weight which is too heavy, lets it fall into the water, and it sinks entirely under. This is what Cox and Carson say it means. But they have with much truth said, 'mere speculation here is of no

value; theories and conjectures with respect to a subject that concerns the faith and the obedience of God's people is of no authority.' We must have a plain proof, that *thus saith* and *thus doeth* the Lord, before we can admit that it is God's word. Where, then, is the *thus saith* and *thus doeth* the Lord, for immersion only? I cannot find it in the Bible.

But to return: we shall find a case of water Baptism, 1 Cor. x. 1, 2: 'Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.' I know our Baptist brethren say it fairly proves immersion. The sea was on either hand; the cloud was before, over, and behind them; so that they were completely surrounded by water. I answer, they did not fall into it like a heavy weight. However, the account given in Exodus, 14th chapter, is somewhat different from yours. 'And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the *dry ground*.' 'But the children of Israel walked upon *dry land* in the midst of the sea.' There were upwards of 620,000 Israelites in this company. How did they get under the water?—the thing was impossible. Exodus xiv. 21: 'And the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea *dry land*, and the waters were divided.' Heb. xi. 29: 'By faith they passed through the Red Sea as by *dry land*.' *Dry land* was under them, before them, and behind them; and, if water was on each side of them, it was at so great a distance that those only who were on the outside of the host could see it. Then in this Baptism there was no immersion. How are our brethren to get out of this difficulty? It is none with us; for we can baptize upon dry ground, as God did the Israelites. The Psalmist has put this subject beyond the reach of useless controversy; for in Psalm lxxvii. 17, while speaking of this very event, he says, 'The clouds *poured out* water.' The only kind of rain that does not wet the ground is

what we call a sprinkling. Here then God's mode of baptizing with water is by sprinkling. Our brethren say there is but one mode. It really seems so; for whether God baptizes with the Spirit or with water, he pours out or sprinkles, and does not immerse. St. Paul was directed to call it Baptism (for the express purpose of showing that the Sacraments of the Jews were types of ours) by the same Spirit that directed Moses and David to record the events. Again, I say we are seeking for the Bible meaning of the word *baptize*. And we see inspired Moses and David, Peter and Paul, and the prophets, explaining it as a pouring, a sprinkling, and not immersing. Thus I have been to the New Testament as well as the Old. From both I have proved, that the word means to pour out, to sprinkle. 'All Scripture is given by inspiration; and is profitable for doctrine and instruction.' And as it has decided that the word does mean to pour, to sprinkle, we ought to bow in reverence to its decision. I am persuaded, that, the more we search the Scriptures, the stronger will be the proof, that the word baptize and the mode of Baptism, as used in the sacred writings, have reference to the applying of the element to the body by pouring or sprinkling, and not the applying of the body to the element by plunging or immersing. Do you know of any prophecy which says, that immersion under water should exist, or be practised in the Church of Christ? I know of none. But there certainly are prophecies concerning the use of water in the Redeemer's kingdom. But there are none in reference to immersion. Indeed neither the word, nor any thing like it, ever occurs as connected with the ordinance of the Gospel. But the word sprinkle is frequently used in types referring to the dispensation of grace; and direct prophecies are made of the use of water, and how the water was to be applied: viz., by pouring on or sprinkling. Isaiah xliv. 3: 'I will pour water on him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground; I will pour my Spirit on thy seed, and my blessing on thine offspring.' Here is mention

made of pouring water and of pouring the Spirit. This is the *mode*, and the offspring are the *subjects*. Again, lii. 15: 'So shall he sprinkle many nations.' This is a prophecy of what should come. Because, though there were many sprinklings under the former dispensation, there was but *one* nation sprinkled. This sprinkling of '*many* nations,' was to take place under the Gospel.

Again, Ezekiel xxxvi. 25: 'Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.' This also was a prophecy of what should come, and could not have its completion under the former dispensation, and of course must take place and have its accomplishment under the Gospel; for, though there were many sprinklings, there was no sprinkling of 'clean water.' Water mixed with 'blood,' 'scarlet wool,' 'the ashes of an heifer,' and with some other things, was sprinkled; but no 'clean,' unmixed, or pure water. God says, 'I will (in the future time) sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.' All of these passages refer to the blessings of the Gospel. That there should be some allusions to so important an ordinance as that of Baptism, was to be expected. The only way in which water is used in the Christian ordinances is in Baptism. The prophecy of its use is pouring and sprinkling, not immersion. They lead us to expect that the mode and meaning which, as I have proved, God affixes to Baptism, would be continued in the Gospel dispensation. It is pouring, sprinkling—not plunging, sinking, dipping. Perhaps an opponent may say, these prophecies are to be taken figuratively, not literally. I ask for proof. Does the Bible say so? If the prophecy had said, 'Then will I immerse you in clean water,' instead of sprinkle you, would you have allowed me to say it must be taken figuratively? But suppose they were to be taken figuratively, it puts immersion still further out of the question. Figurative language is used, because it is stronger than the literal. Now, immersion is a stronger term than pouring out, or sprinkling, and

requires more water. Why was not this term used? Thus, if we go to facts, to prove Baptism, they will always bring us to pour, or sprinkle—never immersion. If, then, we attend to the prophecies, which were the rule of Paul's preaching, the matter is clear respecting both the subjects and mode of Baptism, even beyond the possibility of a doubt. The prophecies I say are clear: 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean;' 'So shall he sprinkle many nations.' This is 'what the Prophets did say should come.' Paul says he 'taught none other things than the Prophets and Moses did say should come.' Acts xxvi. 22. Here is plain truth, Scripture evidence, unaided by metaphysical distinctions and logical deductions; and it is beyond the art of sophistry to deny it. How shall we form an argument to disprove this; or how shall we get rid of the force of it? Can we deny that the Prophets said sprinkling of clean water should come? No; this we cannot deny. Can we deny that the Apostles did teach and practise what the Prophets did say should come? This, again, we cannot deny. Can we undertake to say, that any other sprinkling of clean water is instituted in the church except in Baptism? Certainly not. Sprinkling, then, is the mode of Baptism; and this argument in favour of sprinkling can never be set aside. It is so plain, that with the greatest ease it may be understood. He may run that readeth. So all the instances wherein Baptism is recorded in the New Testament comport with the idea of sprinkling; because they were evidently performed with ease and facility. Indeed there is not an instance where a single circumstance is related which is necessarily connected with immersion, nor from whence it can be inferred; and, in a number of instances, the circumstances plainly forbid even the possibility of immersion. Perhaps I shall be told that Baptism is a washing of the body. Acts xxii. 16: 'Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.' Hebrews x. 22: 'Having our bodies washed with pure water.' Now, if we look into the Bible we shall see that sprinkling the

body was washing it. Our Baptist brethren admit that Baptism and washing are the same thing. This they are obliged to acknowledge, because the translators of the Bible have in so many instances translated the word *baptize* into the word *wash.* But did the translators of the Bible mean to have us understand that washing means plunging, and only plunging, as our friends define Baptism? Or did the translators of the Bible mean to have us understand that religious washing is parallel with sprinkling? They tell us that Christ's feet were washed with the tears of one woman; but do they mean to have us understand they were plunged? Certainly not.

Again, Aaron was consecrated to the priest's office by washing. Exodus xxix. 4: 'And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and thou shalt wash them with water.' This washing is found to be sprinkling. Numb. viii. 6, 7: 'Take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them, *sprinkle* water of purifying upon them.'

Thus we see, that sprinkling the body was washing it. Now, the Apostle himself has pointed out the way in which the body is purified. Heb. ix. 13, 14: 'For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ purge your conscience from dead works,' &c. Heb. x. 22: 'Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.' Now, here, sprinkling purifies the flesh and the conscience, and is the washing required. 'For Baptism does not save us by the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good (a sprinkled) conscience towards God.' Sprinkling we see does purify the flesh. And we are saved 'by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed upon us abundantly,' Titus iii. 6. Indeed it is in vain to

search the Scriptures about Baptism, unless we are willing to see the word *sprinkle* in connexion with it. Under the former dispensation purifications were performed by sprinkling. The door-posts, in Egypt, when the destroying angel passed over, were sprinkled; and this consecrated the family. The altar, the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the sanctuary were consecrated by sprinkling. That sanctuary, with its vessels, was a type of the Gospel Church. So the Prophet, speaking of the coming of Christ, and the Gospel day, declares, Isaiah xxii. 24: 'And they shall hang upon him all the glory of his father's house, the offspring and the issue, all vessels of small quantity, from the vessels of cups, even to the vessels of flaggons.' As the vessels of the sanctuary were consecrated by sprinkling, so the Prophet says, that little children, 'the offspring and the issue,' even the smallest vessels, shall be hung upon Christ, consecrated to God in the same manner, that is by sprinkling. So also the lepers, the unclean, and all the people, were consecrated to God, not by dipping, but by sprinkling. Those sprinklings were emblems of the blood of Christ. The Apostle saith, Heb. ix. 19: 'For when Moses had spoken every precept according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people; saying, This is the blood of the Testament, which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled, likewise with blood, both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry.' Indeed almost all things under the law were purged with blood; that is, with the sprinkling of blood mixed with water, &c. Blood and water were mixed, to signify both the inward and the outward cleansing. Water could purify externally; but blood alone could purify and cleanse the heart. 'Without the shedding of blood there could be no remission.' This mixture of blood and water the Apostle tells us was to be applied by sprinkling. 'He sprinkled the book and all the people.' 'He sprinkled the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry.' He

said, 'This is the blood of the Testament.' The law which the Apostle refers to is recorded, Numb. xix. 9, 10–19. Hence we learn, that we must be cleansed, both internally and externally, by sprinkling; and as the blood of Christ is shed for the cleansing of the heart, water only is now used as an outward expression of inward cleansing by the blood of Christ. How then could God give us a stronger evidence, that sprinkling is sufficient for the outward and inward cleansing of the sinner, than he has done by those plain and positive institutions? Hence the Apostle argues, not from sprinkling to plunging, but from sprinkling to sprinkling. He says: 'Our hearts are sprinkled.' 'We are come to the blood of sprinkling.' The dispensation is changed; but it is a dispensation of sprinkling still, not of mixed, but of clean water. This is a better sacrifice than mixed water, as it gives a more clear and distinct idea of the nature of divine purity and sanctification.

The external visible seal of God's covenant, the ordinance that admits into the visible church, is expressive of what is done to the heart. Circumcision, the former seal, was appointed to show that, in regeneration, the heart is circumcised to the Lord—cut off from sin. Hence we read so often of 'the circumcision of the heart;' that 'the heart must be circumcised to the Lord;' that 'circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter;' that the outward circumcision is a sign of the circumcision of the heart, and a seal of the righteousness of faith; because the Holy Spirit doth mortify, subdue, and cut off from sin, take away wicked and carnal desires, and implant those that are pure and holy. So Baptism, the latter seal of the same covenant, is appointed to show, that in regeneration the heart is baptized to the Lord; that is, cleansed from spiritual pollution, which is sin. Hence we read so often of being 'baptized by the Holy Ghost,' of 'the Baptism of the Spirit,' and of 'the sprinkling of the heart;' because the influences of the Spirit come down as the rain, fall as the dew, or as water poured and sprinkled, and do

cleanse the heart from spiritual pollution, which is sin. Heart circumcision, and heart baptism, are undeniably the same thing. Consequently, external circumcision and external baptism are the same thing likewise. An ordinance is designed to express what is done to the heart. Therefore baptism is a token of the same covenant as circumcision, and equally a seal of the righteousness of the same faith. This idea of the analogy between the outward and inward baptism is further expressed by the following Scriptures, which speak of these baptisms under different names, but parallel to each other. John iii. 5: 'Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' One is the outward, and the other the inward baptism. 2 Cor. i. 22: 'Who hath sealed us, and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.' Outward baptism is here the seal, and the earnest of the Spirit in the heart is regeneration. Titus iii. 5: 'He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost.' Here, again, is the outward and the inward Baptism. Water Baptism is called the washing of regeneration, which is the sign of the regeneration of the heart, as circumcision is said to be the sign of the circumcision of the heart. But the renewing of the Holy Ghost is regeneration itself. Heb. x. 22: 'Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.' The sprinkling of the heart is heart Baptism; and the washing of the body the outward Baptism, which expresses what is done to the heart. It is clearly seen, from these Scriptures, and from what has been said before, that the outward and the inward Baptisms are analagous. The outward is designed to express the inward. We have before shown, that washing and sprinkling is the same thing; and when a part of the body is washed, it is said to be 'clean every whit.' This washing of the body, which expresses what is done to the heart, is the fulfilling the prophecy, 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.' As the heart is baptized, or washed by

sprinkling, so the body must be baptized or washed by sprinkling too; or else it does not bear a resemblance to the inward, and express what is done to the heart.

Again: that the water and the blood, the outward and the inward Baptisms, are parallel with each other, was expressed when, from the pierced side of the blessed Jesus, 'forthwith came there out blood and water.' 1 John v. 6: 'This is he that came by water and by blood, even Jesus Christ; not by water only, but by water and by blood; and it is the Spirit which beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth.' Here, again, is the water and the blood, one outward and the other inward. St. John proceeds: 'For there are three that bear record in Heaven—the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth—the Spirit, the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.' The matter is here stated in the clearest manner possible. So true as there are three who bear record in Heaven, and that these three are one, so true, also, there are three who bear witness on earth, and these three do actually agree in one.—Two of these—namely, the Spirit and the blood—are inward on the heart, but the water is outward on the body. The Spirit is the agent; the water is the visible sign; the blood is the blood of the covenant, which Jesus shed on the cross, and is the price of all our mercies. 'These three,' namely, the Spirit, the water, and the blood, 'agree in one.' God hath joined them together; and no man may put them asunder. The application of water outwardly, represents the application of blood inwardly. By these three we are sanctified, we are washed, we are cleansed.

1st. By the *Spirit*, Rom. xv. 16: 'Being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.' 1 Cor. vi. 11: 'But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified by the Spirit of our God.'

2d. By the *water*, Eph. v. 26: 'That he might sanctify and cleanse it (the church) with the washing of water by the word.'

3d. By the *blood*, Heb. xiii. 12: 'Wherefore Jesus also,

that he might sanctify the people with his own blood.' These are Christ's witnesses in earth. The Spirit is one; the water is one; the blood is one; and these three agree in one.

Two are inward, and one is outward. But what is the mode of application? Is it plunging, or is it sprinkling? Now, if we certainly know how any two, or even how any one of them is applied, we know as certainly how all are applied; for they all agree in one. How then is the Spirit applied? We have seen, before, that the Spirit is applied by effusion, not immersion. Hence the influences of the Spirit are compared to rain and dew. Hosea x. 12: 'Till he come and rain righteousness upon you.' Chap. xiv. 5: 'I will be as the dew to Israel.' These passages plainly speak of the coming down of the Spirit, as the rain and as the dew; and by these the heart is baptized, the heart is sprinkled. That operation of the Spirit by which we are said to be washed, cleansed, and baptized, is by sprinkling or pouring, not immersion. And how is the blood applied? This also is by sprinkling. We are washed with this blood by sprinkling. Heb. xii. 24: 'Ye are come to the blood of sprinkling.' 1 Peter i. 2: 'Unto sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ.' The Spirit then is applied by sprinkling; the blood is applied by sprinkling; and by these two the heart is—'Sprinkled, from an evil conscience,' that is, regenerated. It is then certain, that the water must be applied by sprinkling; as, by the Prophet, God said, 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.' 'So shall he sprinkle many nations.' This argument, as well as the others, is familiar, plain, and easy to be understood, and is supported by the Word of God in the clearest and most positive manner. How then shall we deny it? Can we say that the outward ordinance is not designed to represent that which is done to the heart; or that the water does not agree in one with the Spirit and the blood? No. Can we say that the Spirit and the blood are not sprinkled? No. Can we say that any other mode of

applying water besides sprinkling will agree with the Spirit and the blood, and express what is done to the heart? Surely no. If then the water is not sprinkled, there is no agreement between these witnesses. The water is a visible sign of inward or invisible grace; and so much only as is sufficient for a sign to represent the thing signified is suitable for the ordinance. Plunging is then improper, unscriptural, and very wrong. Nothing can be more unnatural than plunging to represent the influences of the Spirit, or the sprinkling of the blood of Christ on the heart. In other words, plunging cannot represent or be a sign of sprinkling.

But I imagine I hear a Baptist exclaiming 'the *original word!*' and I confess I have no knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, or Latin. But I am informed, the original is as much in favour of sprinkling as of immersion; and while I set a proper value upon human learning and attainments, I always prefer that God's word should be its own interpreter: and I would rather have God's explanation, than all the men-made dictionaries in the world. To His word I have been; and have proved, that the word *baptize* means to pour, to sprinkle—that God performs Baptism by pouring and sprinkling, never immersion. There is but one Baptism, the Christian Baptism, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. These three agree in one; and what is done in the *name* of the three, must be done in the *mode* of the three. The Spirit is applied to those baptized by it; so is the blood; and so must be the water—for the three to agree in one. I have searched the Scriptures to find the meaning of the word *baptize.* In every case it brings me to the word sprinkle, or pour, and not immerse. You can give me no prophecy—no thus saith, or thus doeth the Lord —no answer from the Bible, why I should be immersed.

CONCLUSION.

In reviewing what has been said, we see this express declaration of God by the Prophet, that the time should come when he would sprinkle clean water upon his people; the express declaration of the Apostle, that he taught none other things than what the Prophets did say should come; the universal practice of purification by sprinkling under the former dispensation; and the general concurrent testimony of Scripture, that the external must correspond with and express that which is internal, that the water must agree in one with the Spirit and the blood. These considerations afford the most clear, decided, and unequivocal evidence that sprinkling of clean water is the only Scriptural mode of Baptism, and was the invariable practice of the Apostles. To esteem sprinkling insufficient when God says it is sufficient, to say the least, argues a great distrust in God and want of faith in Jesus Christ; and, what is more, a great degree of self-righteousness. But human nature is prone to err, and go to excess; and though our brethren excommunicate us, we must not excommunicate them; because, doubtless, many of them are sincere.

When Jesus poured water into a basin and washed his disciples' feet, and told them without such washing they had no interest in Him, Peter saith, 'Not my feet only, but my hands and my head.' Peter would have been plunged in a minute had it been convenient, and had not Jesus restrained him: and no wonder if many not so good as Peter should go astray.

I believe human nature has devised this mode of Baptism, and many years' practice has made it the beaten path of some; but from the beginning it was not so.